

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6724**

---

TEX HOLBROOK, II,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DAVID BALLARD, Warden, Mount Olive Correctional Complex,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern  
District of West Virginia, at Charleston. Joseph R. Goodwin,  
District Judge. (2:12-cv-00953)

---

Submitted: August 29, 2013

Decided: September 4, 2013

---

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Tex Holbrook, II, Appellant Pro Se. Robert David Goldberg,  
Assistant Attorney General, Charleston, West Virginia, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tex Holbrook, II, seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Holbrook has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Holbrook's "Motion for Court to Review Facts Supporting Petitioner's Actual and Factual Innocence," deny a certificate of appealability, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral

argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED